# Conference on Disarmament

28 February 2012

English

UNITED NATIONS
DEPOSITORY

JUL 02 2015

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

**Final record of the one thousand two hundred and forty-ninth plenary meeting**
Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Tuesday, 28 February 2012, at 10.15 a.m.

*President*: Mr. Hisham Badr.....(Egypt)

GE.12-63226 (E) 050515 200515

*1263226*

Please recycle

**The President**: I call to order the 1249th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

I would like to extend a warm welcome to Mr. Yerzhan Kazykhanov, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, and I have the pleasure and honour to invite the Minister to take the floor.

**Mr. Kazykhanov** (Kazakhstan): First of all, let me thank you for this opportunity to address such a representative and professional audience.

I want to congratulate the Permanent Representative of Egypt on the assumption of the presidency of the plenary meeting and express confidence that his extensive experience and skilful stewardship of this proceedings will help break the stalemate of our work here.

The year 2011 was marked by a tangible contribution to the global processes of disarmament and non-proliferation. Yet against the backdrop of some encouraging trends, the lack of substantive work in the Conference on Disarmament over the past 16 years continues to cause concern. We believe that this distinguished body should be at the forefront of the disarmament process.

I want to reaffirm that we view the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral body in charge of discussions of key mechanisms for strengthening international security. I have no doubts whatsoever that this forum has great potential and that it makes a significant contribution to the disarmament process.

We do not agree with the proposal to suspend the work of the Conference until there is a propitious political climate. I would like to emphasize that the Conference on Disarmament was established and successfully operated in a much more unfavourable global political setting.

It is our deep-seated belief that all that is required to relaunch substantive work of the Conference is political will. Kazakhstan sincerely hopes that the member States of the Conference will be able to bridge their differences and get down to work on the agenda. We support the proposal made by the distinguished Secretary-General of the Conference to convene a special high-level meeting to revitalize the Conference on Disarmament, as well as to establish a group of eminent persons to explore ways to break the stalemate.

The proposal to merge, down the road, the two entities — the Conference on Disarmament and the United Nations Disarmament Commission — into a single body is worth exploring. In our view, we have to carefully consider all possible ramifications of such a decision. We should also carefully examine the proposal to appoint three special coordinators, on the agenda, rules of procedure and membership.

At the same time, we believe that procedural changes and systematic reforms in the Conference on Disarmament cannot be a panacea. We agree with those delegations that argue that the crux of the matter lies elsewhere.

The lack of progress in the work of the Conference is a reflection of the state of the global disarmament process in general. States have different approaches to issues of national and international security, and there is no use blaming the rules of procedure of the Conference on Disarmament for the existence of their differences. The principle of consensus adopted at the Conference on Disarmament is fair and allows us to draft balanced documents that take into account the interests of all stakeholders.

Yet we consider it unacceptable to use the principle of consensus to block the work of the Conference. It is our understanding that national interests should be protected while we are engaged in a constructive discussion and a search for mutually acceptable solutions. Speedy practical steps towards disarmament are in our common interest.

Similarly, we see no value in trying to tackle some of the issues outside the Conference. The establishment of alternative negotiation forums, without the involvement of a number of key players in disarmament, will only result in the adoption of documents that will not be universal and will fail to work effectively.

As for Kazakhstan, the following four issues are equally critical, in terms of their priority, for the work of the Conference on Disarmament: nuclear disarmament, a fissile material cut-off treaty, the provision of negative security assurances and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Each of them is important and requires collective action. In our view, we should start, as soon as possible, our work on all of them concurrently.

Our country, which voluntarily relinquished the fourth largest nuclear arsenal in the world and shut down one of the largest nuclear test sites, at Semipalatinsk, remains a staunch supporter of the global process of non-proliferation and nuclear threat reduction.

Today, it is highly important to overcome the stagnation in the global disarmament process, with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) being its cornerstone.

We believe that the time has come to develop clear mechanisms for enforcement action against States that act outside the NPT or intend to withdraw from the Treaty. It is necessary to ensure unconditional implementation by States parties of their obligations, as embodied in the unity of the three basic elements – disarmament, non-proliferation and peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

In 2011, at the sixty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly, President Nursultan Nazarbayev introduced a number of proposals in the area of non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament for the nuclear-weapon States that reflected today's realities.

The head of our State called for the start of deliberations on the adoption, under the auspices of the United Nations, of a universal declaration of a nuclear-weapon-free world, which would enshrine the commitment of all States to gradually move towards the ideals of a nuclear-weapon-free world. This would represent an important step towards the adoption of a convention on prohibition of nuclear weapons.

It is regrettable that some rather influential countries still refuse to sign and ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). In theory, such a situation does not prevent nuclear Powers from continuing nuclear-weapon testing and the "threshold" countries from pursuing their own nuclear and missile programmes with impunity.

Kazakhstan has welcomed the news of CTBT ratification by Indonesia, one of the countries whose ratification is required for the Treaty to enter into force. I take this opportunity to congratulate Ghana, Guatemala and Guinea on the completion of domestic procedures for the CTBT's entry into force. We also welcome the firm commitment by the United States Administration to seek ratification of the Treaty by the United States Senate, and we do hope that this process will not take too long. Our country urges all other States that have not yet ratified this important international instrument to speed up the process.

Fully complying with the objectives of the CTBT is the resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in December 2009, on the initiative of Kazakhstan, declaring 29 August — the date of the official closing of the former Semipalatinsk nuclear testing site — as the International Day against Nuclear Tests. In 2011, a number of major international anti-nuclear events were organized in Kazakhstan and outside the country with its involvement. I would like to mention here the Forum for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World convened last October in Astana and Semey to commemorate the International Day against Nuclear Tests and the twentieth anniversary of the closing of the Semipalatinsk test site.

The participants of that Forum adopted the Astana Declaration calling on all countries with nuclear arsenals to eliminate them as soon as possible.

As a country that has established, in cooperation with its regional neighbours, a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia, Kazakhstan calls for the development of an international legally binding instrument to provide security assurances by the nuclear Powers to non-nuclear countries. I would also emphasize the strong commitment by the regional States to complete the institutionalization of the Semipalatinsk Treaty and their readiness for a constructive dialogue with the big five nuclear Powers for the early signing of a protocol on negative assurances to the States of the zone.

In the Astana Declaration adopted by the Council of Foreign Ministers, the member States of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation expressed their conviction that progress in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all their aspects is the basis for the strengthening of international peace and security. A separate resolution of the Astana Council of Foreign Ministers was also devoted to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Promoting the convening of the 2012 Conference is among the priorities of Kazakhstan's current chairmanship at the Organization of Islamic Cooperation.

Given the "nuclear renaissance" and the growing interest of various countries in nuclear energy, Kazakhstan is ready to make a significant contribution to the common cause as one of the world's largest suppliers of uranium products.

Adhering to the principle of equal access to the peaceful atom, Kazakhstan has submitted to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) an application to host an international bank for low-enriched uranium.

We strongly believe that the establishment of additional reserves of low-enriched uranium under the auspices of the IAEA will promote guaranteed access for all States to nuclear fuel and in no way affect the legitimate and inalienable right of each State party to the NPT to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, provided they fully meet the NPT conditions.

The year 2012 promises to be packed with events in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. The second Global Summit on Nuclear Security will be held on 26 and 27 March in Seoul. The Preparatory Committee for the 2015 Review Conference of the States parties to the NPT will start its proceedings at the end of April in Vienna. All these developments confirm the willingness of States and their leaders to address the issues of disarmament and non-proliferation through joint efforts. We sincerely hope that the Conference on Disarmament will overcome the stalemate for the sake of our common goal – security and peace on Earth.

**The President**: I would like to warmly thank Mr. Yerzhan Kazykhanov, Minister for Foreign Affairs from Kazakhstan, for his statement and for the kind words to the President. Now allow me to suspend the meeting for a short moment in order to escort the Minister from the chamber.

*The meeting was suspended at 10.25 a.m. and resumed at 10.45 a.m.*

**The President** (*spoke in Arabic*): I have the pleasure and the honour to welcome Mr. Nasser Judeh, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Jordan, who will address us today. You have the floor, Sir.

**Mr. Judeh** (Jordan) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to begin by expressing my great pleasure at having the opportunity to address this groundbreaking Conference and I wish to offer you, Mr. President, my sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency

for the current session. I wish you every success in directing its work and furthering its achievements in the interests of international security and stability.

We are deliberating today at a time when, more than at any moment in the past, the world is facing multidimensional international crises which cannot be remedied effectively without concerted international efforts and true partnership. It is clearly evident that no State can confront such crises alone since the challenges facing us are global, and the solutions must likewise be global. In this regard, my country believes that there is no alternative to diplomacy and constructive dialogue in order to meet the global challenges threatening international security and stability. The best way to resolve disarmament and international security issues is through solutions agreed upon during the process of multilateral negotiations. Success in this field would effectively help to overcome many of the other serious challenges facing the international community, and primarily the challenge of making substantive and tangible progress in achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

Security and stability are indispensable prerequisites for the progress that we are seeking in all spheres of life, since they have a direct impact on people's economic, social and cultural well-being. Accordingly, my country attaches particular importance to the Conference on Disarmament, which is today the sole forum for multilateral negotiations in the field of disarmament. We are therefore looking forward to a breakthrough in the Conference's work this year, by way of agreement on a programme of work that will restore the confidence of the family of nations in the Conference and the outstanding contributions that it has made to the conclusion of numerous important international treaties in the field of disarmament which have played an effective role in strengthening international security and stability.

The challenge facing the Conference lies in the establishment of a balanced programme of work which, on the one hand, takes account of the national priorities of States and, on the other, is conducive to the fulfilment of the Conference's mandate. This will be achieved only if member States demonstrate genuine political will and the flexibility needed to break the deadlock that has afflicted the Conference since its last success in 1996. The time has come, moreover, for the Conference to consider increasing its membership, in accordance with its rules of procedure, in order to make it more representative and ensure that it better reflects the situation of our world today; and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan supports the appointment of a special coordinator on this matter. In this connection, I would also like to confirm Jordan's desire to become a full member of the Conference on Disarmament at the earliest possible opportunity.

My country has diligently endeavoured to establish solid foundations for peace and to support all efforts and initiatives aimed at ensuring security and stability in all States throughout the world. Peace and security will not be achieved in the shadow of the perils and fears of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and in particular nuclear weapons, which unquestionably pose a grave threat to mankind as a whole. This is the reason for our resolute and unwavering advocacy of the elimination of all forms, types and categories of weapons of mass destruction and the prevention of their proliferation, and we are now looking forward to the day when the entire world will be free of such weapons. In keeping with that firm conviction, and believing in that lofty and noble objective, we acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Biological Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention, and have supported all disarmament-oriented endeavours.

The Middle East region is undergoing radical changes and facing great challenges. These require concerted efforts on the part of the international community to prevent matters from getting out of control and leading to developments with potentially catastrophic implications, not just for the region but for the security and peace of the whole

world. From this perspective, the appeals and initiatives dating back to the 1970s to make the Middle East a region free of weapons of mass destruction, and primarily nuclear weapons, acquire particular importance, and it has become more urgent than ever for practical steps to be taken to ensure the effective achievement of that goal, thereby reinforcing security and stability in the region and, consequently, throughout the world.

My country welcomed the outcome of the May 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which restored the international community's confidence in the non-proliferation regime. The success of the Review Conference would not have come about if agreement had not been reached on practical steps to implement the resolution on the Middle East which was adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and which called, inter alia, for the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, and their delivery systems, in the Middle East. In the light of this, my country reaffirms the importance of taking all requisite steps to convene a conference in 2012 with the participation of all Middle Eastern States and the aim of making the Middle East a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. The events and tension that the region is witnessing are a warning that matters are getting out of control, and should spur the countries of the region and of the world as a whole to make genuine efforts to rid the region of nuclear weapons. In addition to making an effective contribution to the strengthening of regional and international security and stability, this would be a step towards achieving the universality of the Treaty and would ward off many dangers, such as nuclear confrontation or a nuclear arms race.

The successful attempts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa, Latin America, South-East Asia, Central Asia and the South Pacific, and the clearly evident manner in which these have helped to strengthen the non-proliferation regime and preclude an arms race, should increasingly convince all parties that making the Middle East a zone free of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction is not only necessary but also feasible. Our success in achieving this lofty goal would be a highly significant step towards building confidence and promoting peace among the States of the region and avoiding an arms race which the region certainly does not need. It would also constitute an incentive for any State possessing nuclear weapons to get rid of them, and for any State thinking of acquiring them to refrain from doing so. Moreover, making the Middle East a zone free of weapons of mass destruction would constitute a guarantee that nuclear Powers would not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against States of the region. It would also be an auspicious moment for Israel, the only State in the region which has not acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to do so, and for certain other States in the region which have not acceded to the Biological Weapons Convention or the Chemical Weapons Convention to alter their position and accede thereto.

In conclusion, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, under the leadership of King Abdullah Bin Al Hussein II, having often advocated the universality of treaties on weapons of mass destruction, emphasizes the need to strengthen the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as well as the need for effective international cooperation to enhance international nuclear security by preventing the smuggling of nuclear materials and establishing institutional frameworks to guarantee active international cooperation, information flows and concerted efforts to achieve nuclear security. I wish your distinguished Conference every success.

**The President** (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to thank Mr. Nasser Judeh, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Jordan, for coming here and addressing the Conference. Please allow me to suspend the meeting for a moment so I can escort the Minister from the chamber.

*The meeting was briefly suspended.*

**The President**: I would like to extend a warm welcome to Mr. Ali Akbar Selehi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and have the pleasure and honour to invite our guest to take the floor.

**Mr. Selehi** (Islamic Republic of Iran): It is indeed a great pleasure to address the Conference on Disarmament today. At the outset I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. President, on the assumption of the presidency of the Conference. I am aware and appreciative of your diligent efforts in trying to pave the way for the resumption of substantive negotiations in the Conference. I wish you and the Secretary-General of the Conference every success in your important missions.

We attach great importance to the Conference on Disarmament as the sole negotiating body in the field of disarmament. The impressive record of achievements, special composition, unique rules of procedure and the wide agenda of the Conference makes this body the only forum suitable for negotiation on disarmament. If we were to try to rebuild a forum to start negotiations on disarmament and international security issues it wouldn't be much different from the existing Conference on Disarmament.

The international community today is faced with serious common challenges such as the continued existence of nuclear weapons, climate change, the outbreak of infectious diseases, the economic crisis and poverty. These common threats to human beings are imminent, interlinked and multifaceted. The sense of insecurity in facing them creates a dire situation whereby States can no longer exclusively rely on the narrowly perceived classic definition of national security. No country, regardless of its size and power, can claim that it can preserve its national security and protect itself against all these odds alone. Hence, all nations must develop the urge to join hands so as to achieve sustainable security.

Sustainable security necessitates justice, respect for the rule of law, faithful cooperation and change in our attitudes and a full departure from the old cold war antagonistic presumptions that no longer fit with the requirements of the new world and its common challenges. Non-discrimination, inclusiveness, rationality, realistic threat perception, respecting the rights of all nations, and serving enhanced security for all will certainly contribute greatly to its realization.

However, the gravest threat to sustainable security remains the existence of nearly 23,000 nuclear weapons in the arsenals of a few countries capable of destroying the whole world many times over. The danger of these weapons would be enormously increased if some of these countries feel free to officially threaten others, including non-nuclear-weapon States, with the use of these immoral and illegitimate weapons. It is a matter of serious concern that humankind continues to live under the shadow of the threat of nuclear weapons, while the inhumane massacre in Hiroshima and Nagasaki still remains imprinted in our memories. As long as nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction exist and are continuously upgraded, there would always be a risk for their use and also vertical and horizontal proliferation.

The issue of revitalization of the Conference has been a hot topic in recent years. Lots of radical procedural ideas were presented in the high-level meeting and its follow-up process. However, the root cause of such unfortunate continued deadlock in the Conference is not a procedural problem or institutional inefficiency; it is rather the lack of political will. Hence, the repercussions of the existence of nuclear weapons, including the military alliances based on the nuclear umbrella, nuclear sharing and deployment of nuclear weapons in the territory of other non-nuclear-weapon States, heightened global military expenditure and plan for spending $700 billion on modernizing nuclear warheads and building new production facilities, the strategic shift and the unilateral approach adopted by some major Powers, and new military doctrines setting the rationale for the possible use of nuclear weapons and, in brief, lack of progress towards nuclear disarmament, has paralysed

the disarmament machinery for a long time. Consequently, the Conference has been unable to embark upon meaningful negotiations on the most urgent security requirement for our world today, namely nuclear disarmament.

At this juncture, I would like to highlight that the current exercise of double standards and discrimination are the main threats for the credibility of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). This Treaty in no way provides the right for nuclear-weapon States to keep their nuclear arsenals indefinitely, and consequently the indefinite extension of the NPT does not mean in any way the indefinite possession of nuclear weapons. Let's bear in mind that in the NPT 2010 Review Conference, the Non-Aligned Movement proposed the adoption of a legal framework with specified timelines for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by 2025. Therefore, the three pillars of the NPT should not be narrowed down to just non-proliferation. The two other pillars are equally important and should have the same weight in regime-building including institutions, regulations and commitments. Nuclear energy is not equating with nuclear weapons, and as a result the right of all States for peaceful nuclear activities should be guaranteed. Monopolizing selfishly the scientific knowledge and the technology of peaceful nuclear energy and depriving others of it through various means, including atrocious assassination of scientists, is an illusion which will certainly not lead to the preservation of their perceived supremacy.

The raison d'être of the Conference is disarmament. Its agenda is designed in a manner that facilitates the start of negotiation of jointly reinforcing international instruments for nuclear disarmament. Therefore the early commencement of negotiations within the Conference on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, through a nuclear weapons convention, is the urgent need of the disarmament machinery today. If we start negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention in the Conference, we would be in a position to comprehensively tackle all the core issues in the agenda in a comprehensive and balanced manner. As I proposed last year in this chamber, this convention could be a framework treaty encompassing a total ban on use, production, possession, development, stockpiling, deployment and transfer of nuclear weapons, renouncing the deterrence values of nuclear weapons in defence doctrines, irreversible elimination of all stocks of weapons-grade fissile material, de-alerting of nuclear warheads and their destruction in a verifiable manner in a phased programme and within a specific time frame.

The piecemeal approach is no solution to achieve a world free from nuclear weapons. In fact, in the initial stages of negotiation of the Biological Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention, the ban on those categories of weapons of mass destruction was considered somehow ambitious, unpractical and unfeasible. But through the mobilization of necessary political will at the global level, the international community was able to resolve many fundamental differences over issues which apparently seemed insurmountable.

Mr. President, you are well aware of the desire of the majority of the countries in the region to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Iran and Egypt are among the most eager advocates of establishing such a zone in the region. However, the possession of nuclear weapons by the only non-party to the NPT in the region, which makes it a serious threat to the stability of the entire region and international peace and security, is the only obstacle in the way of creation of such a zone. Its repeated record on the constant use of inhumane weapons against civilians have furthermore intensified the security concerns in the region. It is a matter of concern that all efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East have not yet succeeded, due to its persistent refusal to join the NPT and to place its nuclear facilities under the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards system. It is a matter of more concern that in its

defiance of the demands of the international community, it enjoys the full support of some nuclear-weapon States. Hypocrisy, selectiveness and discrimination describe well the behaviour of some major Powers towards the region. The members of the NPT are punished while those who are outside the NPT are rewarded generously.

I would like to re-emphasize that we do not see any glory, pride or power in nuclear weapons, quite the opposite: based on the religious decree issued by our Supreme Leader, the production, possession, use or threat of use of nuclear weapons are illegitimate, futile, harmful, dangerous and prohibited as a great sin. We have clearly stated time and again that there are two alternatives in dealing with the Iranian peaceful nuclear programme: one way is engagement, cooperation and interaction, and the other is confrontation and conflict. The Islamic Republic of Iran, confident of the peaceful nature of its nuclear programme, has always insisted on the first alternative. When it comes to our relevant rights and obligations, our consistent position is that Iran does not seek confrontation, nor does it want anything beyond its inalienable legitimate rights. What we are looking for is justice and the rejection of double standards.

In conclusion, we urge all countries to be united and work together for the total elimination of all nuclear weapons to pave the way for sustainable security. I have confidence that this august body can make an important contribution in this respect. The Islamic Republic of Iran stands prepared for further engagement in a constructive negotiation in this regard.

**The President**: I would like to thank Mr. Ali Akbar Selehi for his statement and for the kind words to the President. Now allow me to suspend the meeting for a short moment in order to escort the Minister from the chamber.

*The meeting was briefly suspended.*

**The President**: I would like to extend a warm welcome to Mr. Anifah Aman, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Malaysia, and have the pleasure and honour to invite the Minister to take the floor.

**Mr. Aman** (Malaysia): Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you on your assumption as the President of the Conference on Disarmament. Our delegation deeply appreciates the efforts and consultations that you have undertaken thus far. Let me assure you of Malaysia's cooperation and support in your endeavours to move the Conference forward and begin its substantive work in 2012.

For over a decade, we have heard statements from different States on the growing frustration on the state of paralysis in the Conference on Disarmament. That frustration culminated in the recent United Nations General Assembly in New York, where the First Committee heard the overwhelming call for the commencement of substantive work in the Conference. This call was echoed by none other than the Secretary-General of the United Nations himself, who made it clear in his message to the Conference that substantive work must begin without further delay and a programme of work must be adopted at the earliest possible time.

The Conference on Disarmament has brought many significant outcomes since its inception in 1979. Since then, we have witnessed the conclusion of the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

Regretfully the significance of these important events has been reduced by the inability of the Conference to move forward in the past 15 years. For too long, the Conference has been in a stalemate, unable to progress because of our own fears and reluctance to engage constructively in the discussions.

In this regard, Malaysia takes note of the ideas proposed by you, Mr. President, and my delegation is giving serious consideration to this initiative. We would also like to express our willingness to engage with all member States and call upon others to do so to move forward the process.

Time is not on our side. As the seconds tick by, interest in the Conference will begin to fade away. There is a growing concern that it will become irrelevant and unjustified in its existence. For member States, there is real concern that the disarmament agenda will be discussed in other forums should the Conference fail to progress in doing substantive work any time soon.

Malaysia remains steadfast in our belief that the Conference will be able to achieve its objectives. It would however, have to reconquer its relevance as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of the international community. And we must not delay any further on this matter. It has to start now, for another unproductive session in 2012 would seriously undermine the establishment of this body and its mandate as a disarmament negotiation forum.

Malaysia has always maintained a principled position on general and complete disarmament of weapons of mass destruction, and measures to achieve this goal should be through the multilateral process. I wish to reiterate Malaysia's position that nuclear disarmament remains our highest priority. We firmly believe in the complete and total elimination of nuclear weapons as the only solution against the possible use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

In this regard, let me highlight to you Malaysia's commitment towards the nuclear disarmament process. In 1996, Malaysia initiated a resolution titled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons" at the United Nations General Assembly, which has since then been tabled annually. This resolution continues to receive growing support from member countries, including three countries that possess nuclear weapons. On our efforts to strengthen export control, Malaysia has shown its commitment in addressing the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction by establishing national export control measures; the Strategic Trade Act 2010 was enacted in 2010 which then came into force on 1 April 2011. Malaysia is one of those few countries to have such important legislation on export control in place within the region.

We remain convinced that for the survival of mankind, all nuclear weapons must be eliminated and the ongoing development of new types of nuclear weapons needs to be urgently addressed. The end of the cold war has not removed the danger of a possible nuclear catastrophe. In fact, in the context of pre-emptive action, the risks of a conflict involving nuclear weapons may even have been increased. The stated willingness to use nuclear weapons in response to others' use of weapons of mass destruction — whether nuclear, chemical or biological — and even conventional weapons, should be a major cause of concern for all of us.

Malaysia strongly believes that international peace and security could not be achieved through the doctrine of deterrence or strategic superiority, since the prolonged existence of nuclear weapons increases the sense of insecurity among States. It is worrying to learn that the nuclear-weapon States have drifted away from the direction towards a nuclear-free world and have continued to enrich their existing nuclear programme. Failure to eliminate nuclear weapons would not only aggravate international tensions but also increase the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

We believe that the only sustainable way to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons is through the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the nuclear-weapon States.

If we are to move forward, we need to resolve politically the current disarmament challenges that entangle the Conference. In this regard, we believe that it is pertinent that commitment by the leadership at the highest level be increased in order to achieve the vision of a world free of nuclear weapons.

We welcome the discussions among the five permanent members of the Security Council on verification issues and confidence-building measures related to nuclear disarmament, as part of their commitment to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty article VI obligations. These efforts, we believe, will be the start of many more to come, especially among the nuclear-weapon States in realizing the dream of a world free of nuclear weapons.

It is also vital for member States to exercise flexibility and political will so as to rejuvenate the stalled multilateral negotiations towards a successful conclusion of the programme of work. The consensus rule in the Conference is an important element which instils the need to find common ground in our discussions.

Let not the de facto veto possessed by each member State be abused in our efforts to carry out the mandate of the Conference. While national security concerns are paramount in the process of decision-making by member States, the goals of complete and total disarmament of nuclear weapons are equally as important.

With its membership of 65 countries, the Conference is a special group entrusted with an important mandate. Since 1999, this membership has not expanded to include other countries that have yet to contribute to the good work of the Conference. Malaysia feels that this special privilege should also be extended to other United Nations member States. Malaysia reiterates our position for the Conference to seriously consider the expansion of membership.

Malaysia also recognizes the contributions made by civil society to the work of the Conference. Their efforts are important in generating support for nuclear disarmament at the grass-roots level, and their invaluable inputs would enrich the work of the Conference and help to stimulate substantive discussions. Such expansion of the membership and engagement with civil society would help to create much-needed political impetus and contribute to the work of the Conference.

The disarmament community has benefited a lot through engagement with civil society, as evident in the case of landmines, small arms, light weapons and other arms control treaties. The Conference would benefit from the valuable insights, views, data and research of civil society. It may be the greatly needed impetus that the Conference needs to move forward and fulfil the role it was created for. We hope for further enriched discussions that would pave the way for further participation of NGOs and civil society in sessions ahead.

The Conference needs to explore all available avenues in moving forward the disarmament agenda. Malaysia reiterates its support for the convening of a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which we feel is a practical way to move forward and revitalize the Conference. Notwithstanding this, Malaysia is ready to explore any other feasible ideas put forth.

The challenge of nuclear disarmament is one that should not only be addressed by the Conference. The Conference must be creative, innovative and capable of adapting to a dynamic and ever-changing global environment. For this purpose, it would also be necessary for us to have a close look at the methodology of work. We will have to assess the effectiveness of existing mechanisms and to revitalize them, and if necessary, to create new ones.

In this regard, we call upon the Conference to be faithful to the principle of non-discrimination and to promote greater inclusiveness and openness of the Conference.

Malaysia hopes that every effort would be made to accommodate the concerns of every member of the Conference and to arrive at a consensus based on the rules of procedure, so as to ensure its acceptance by all States. The legitimate concerns of member States of the Conference should be given the serious consideration they deserve, as they are issues to be addressed and also dealt with.

Mr. President, we appreciate the transparent manner in which you and previous Presidents have conducted your work. Such an approach, we believe, would enable us to move forward and focus our efforts on reaching a consensus on a programme of work.

On that note, for the Conference to move forward, Malaysia proposes the following:

First, all member States should demonstrate strong political will with the readiness to compromise and exercise the utmost flexibility in order to start substantive work in the Conference.

Second, the expansion of membership of the Conference will ensure a greater engagement for members to play their part and collectively address the issue of disarmament and non-proliferation.

Third, we call for the increase of interactive sessions with civil society, in order to uphold the principle of openness, transparency and inclusiveness.

Mr. President, let me conclude my statement by reaffirming Malaysia's commitment to general and complete disarmament. My delegation remains ready to work with you and other member States towards achieving a positive and successful outcome to the session of the Conference on Disarmament. We very much welcome every opportunity to advance the multilateral disarmament agenda, and in particular in the work of the Conference.

**The President**: I would like to thank Mr. Anifah Aman, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Malaysia, for his statement and for his kind words to the President. Now allow me to suspend the meeting for a short moment in order to escort the Minister from the chamber.

*The meeting was briefly suspended.*

**The President**: I would like to extend a warm welcome to Mr. Enrique Castillo, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica, and have the pleasure and honour to invite the Minister to take the floor.

**Mr. Castillo** (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): Costa Rica is firmly committed to the international legal system and believes that international disarmament can be achieved through dialogue and the negotiation of legal instruments. It is therefore not only an honour but also an obligation for me to address the United Nations forum mandated to negotiate universal legally binding agreements. As you all know, Costa Rica is one of the observer States in this Conference and has been requesting admission as a full member since 1994.

The rules of procedure of the Conference call for its membership to be reviewed periodically, and for more than a decade this has been one of the issues pending before the Conference. With the aim of carrying our work forward, at least as far as membership is concerned, we have suggested that the member States appoint a special coordinator to conduct an objective analysis of the matter of membership, without prejudice to such a coordinator's final recommendations.

My country has sufficient credentials and, above all, the moral authority that comes with actually practising disarmament to become a member of this institution. Several decades ago we decided to lay down our arms and abolish the army, and to base our security and defence on dialogue and the international legal order. Those decision have not come free of challenges. Only a few months ago, Nicaragua invaded our territory, and we

appealed to the Organization of American States and the International Court of Justice in order to put an end to the violation of our rights. Respect for international law, with the goal of achieving disarmament, and for international humanitarian law should strengthen one another in a consistent manner. In that vein, I am also pleased to announce that, on 16 February, just a few days ago, Costa Rica, by depositing the instrument of ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, became the first country in the Americas to ratify all the international humanitarian law conventions.

Costa Rica, therefore, has much to offer the Conference in the implementation of its agenda. We believe that drafting a treaty to ban the use of fissile material should be the next logical step in the matter of nuclear disarmament. That is a fundamental step if we want to achieve peace and security in a world without nuclear weapons, as set forth in the goals of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Until such negotiations get under way, we call on the States that possess nuclear weapons to declare and maintain a moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices.

I would also like to comment on the next point on the agenda, nuclear disarmament, and remind you of the outline for a model nuclear weapons convention submitted to the United Nations Secretary-General in 2007 by my country and Malaysia. This should be our highest aspiration, and for that reason our proposal remains on the table. Such a convention would prohibit the development, testing, manufacture, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use of nuclear weapons. States that possess nuclear weapons would be obliged to destroy their arsenals in a phased process. The convention would also prohibit the production of fissile material. An international system of monitoring would be set up to ensure compliance. The experience of the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons would be taken into account.

We also believe that it is vital to prevent the arms race in outer space and, of course, to reach international agreements on negative security assurances on the use of nuclear weapons for countries that do not possess them.

I would like to mention an event closely related to that latter point, which took place a few days ago in Mexico City at the Council of Tlatelolco, which is currently presided over by Costa Rica. I am talking about the 45th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. In Latin America we pioneered the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones just as the nuclear arms race was at its height. We did not even have the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. By 2002, all States in the region had become parties to the Treaty. Other regions have followed our example, and today we may say that, thanks to the treaties of Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Central Asia, and the unilateral declaration by Mongolia, 114 countries are bound by those limitations on the testing, use, manufacture, production and acquisition of any type of nuclear weaponry. In order to complement those provisions, a legally binding international treaty to provide States that do not have nuclear weapons with assurances that such weapons will not be used against them is urgently needed.

I would like to finish as I started, with a request that my country's voice, alongside that of other countries that have also requested to join the ranks of member States, be given a chance to be heard. The outcomes of the work accomplished in this auditorium affect the whole world. It is ironic and unjustifiable that a country that has achieved total disarmament and the ideals pursued by this Conference should not be one of its members.

**The President**: I would like to thank Mr. Enrique Castillo, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica, for his statement to the Conference. Now allow me to suspend the meeting for a short moment in order to escort the Minister from the chamber.

*The meeting was briefly suspended.*

**The President**: I would like to extend a warm welcome to Mr. Ryuji Yamane, Parliamentary Senior Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, and have the pleasure and honour to invite our guest to take the floor.

(*spoke in Japanese*)

**Mr. Yamane** (Japan) (*spoke in Japanese*): It is a great honour for me to be given this opportunity to address the Conference on Disarmament in this historic chamber. I welcome the efforts of the President to pull the Conference out of its years of deadlock and to revitalize its work.

Just under one year ago, Japan suffered the unprecedented disaster of the great East Japan earthquake. On this occasion, I would like to express my sincere appreciation for the assistance given by the international community as a symbol of warm solidarity. This disaster led Japan to once again recognize the significance of our global bonds of friendship. In response to the support from all over the world, Japan, based on its historical experience, will continue to contribute to the creation of a peaceful and stable international society through disarmament.

The Prague speech in 2009 by President Barack Obama of the United States increased momentum for nuclear disarmament. In the same year, the Conference on Disarmament adopted a programme of work and agreed to a mandate on each of its core agenda items of nuclear disarmament, a treaty banning the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons purposes (FMCT), negative security assurances and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Despite this progress, the Conference, which has produced important disarmament treaties in the past, has remained in stalemate. This has been a cause for concern for the whole world. I am aware of the various attempts to overcome this situation. In 2010 the Secretary-General of the United Nations convened a high-level meeting to revitalize the Conference, and in last year's United Nations General Assembly three draft resolutions on the revitalization of this body were submitted. The subject of how to move the Conference forward has generated vigorous debate, but an effective breakthrough solution has yet to be found.

While there is deeply rooted opposition to taking multilateral disarmament negotiations outside the Conference, there is the possibility that the primary agenda items handled by the Conference could be discussed or negotiated elsewhere if this year again the Conference fails to adopt and implement a programme of work that enables the commencement of substantive work. If the Conference is unable to promptly start negotiations on an FMCT, despite the support and the common recognition by the international community that it is the next step in multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations, then the whole raison d'être of the Conference will be called into question. From this perspective, this year is of critical importance. I would like to stress to all the members of the Conference on Disarmament the necessity of sharing broadly at the political level the sense of urgency and of overcoming the current state of affairs as soon as possible.

Please allow me to touch upon the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) regime. Japan attaches great importance to maintaining and strengthening the NPT regime as a multilateral effort toward nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. From this year the 2015 NPT review process will begin, and progress that balances the three pillars of the Treaty, namely nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, is imperative for maintaining and strengthening the NPT regime. It was with this in mind that Japan and Australia jointly launched, as a contribution to the NPT review process, the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI), which is a cross-regional group of 10 countries. The NPDI makes realistic proposals for the realization of a

world without nuclear weapons. To date, three ministerial-level meetings have taken place, and the next one will be in Turkey this April. At the upcoming meeting we intend to express our political will for the steady implementation of the 2010 NPT action plan, and also to put forward concrete proposals to that end.

Japan has devoted itself to disarmament and non-proliferation education in the belief that we must pass on knowledge to future generations about the catastrophic reality of nuclear weapons. In this connection, Japan has decided to hold, jointly with the United Nations University, the Global Forum on Disarmament and Non-proliferation Education, which was postponed due to the great East Japan earthquake, in the city of Nagasaki on 10 and 11 August this year. Our aim is to contribute to the development of further efforts and to promote cooperation and a common understanding of the importance of disarmament and non-proliferation education with the participation of governments, international organizations and civil society. We welcome the participation of distinguished delegates of the Conference at this forum as well as at the Hiroshima and Nagasaki peace memorial ceremonies.

Finally, in November last year a permanent exhibition on the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which is similar to the one in New York, was opened here in the United Nations Office at Geneva. We hope that it promotes understanding of the terrible devastation caused by the use of nuclear weapons and further deepens the recognition of the necessity of strengthened disarmament efforts by the whole international community. I wish to express my gratitude to the staff of the United Nations, including Mr. Tokayev, Secretary-General of the Conference, and Mr. Chikvaidze, Chief Librarian at the United Nations Office at Geneva, for their work to bring the atomic bomb exhibition to fruition.

**The President** (*spoke in Japanese*):

(*spoke in English*)

I would like to thank Mr. Yamane, Parliamentary Senior Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs, for his statement and for his kind words to the President. And I am sure that I speak on behalf of all the members of the Conference on Disarmament if we ask you to accept our best wishes for the Japanese people in the aftermath of the Fukushima earthquake, and the support of the international community will always be with your heroic and great people.

Now allow me to suspend the meeting for a short moment in order to escort the Vice-Minister from the chamber.

*The meeting was briefly suspended.*

**The President**: I would like to extend a warm welcome to Mr. Kim Bong-hyun, Deputy Minister for Multilateral and Global Affairs from the Republic of Korea, and I have the pleasure and honour to invite our guest to take the floor.

**Mr. Kim** Bong-hyun (Republic of Korea): Let me begin by congratulating you, Mr. President, on the assumption of the presidency of the 2012 session of the Conference on Disarmament. I would also extend my sincere wishes to the other five Presidents for the success of their endeavours. As an ardent supporter of multilateral efforts for disarmament and non-proliferation, the Republic of Korea assures you of its full support and cooperation throughout this year.

Last year, many delegations here addressed this Conference with high hopes as we had seen a number of positive developments in the previous years. In 2010, the first Nuclear Security Summit was held in Washington D.C., highlighting the gravity of the threat of nuclear terrorism and the need to reduce this threat through enhanced nuclear security and international cooperation. Following the Washington Summit, the 2010 NPT Review Conference adopted an action plan, a road map for all countries in the field of

nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Moreover, the entry into force of the New START Treaty between the United States and Russia strengthened the global momentum for efforts toward a world free of nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately, such developments, significant as they are, were not able to jump-start the substantive work of the Conference. It is indeed regrettable that the long stalemate has only been extended for another year. We have to take seriously the fact that the patience of the international community is wearing thin. At the United Nations General Assembly last summer, which was held as a follow-up to the high-level meeting in September 2010, as well as at the recent session of the First Committee of the General Assembly, delegations from all over the world spoke with the same voice in emphasizing that the Conference on Disarmament should break the stalemate and promptly adopt a programme of work to embark on substantive work in 2012.

We should keep in mind the message of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the Conference this January. He made clear that the General Assembly is ready to consider other options to move the disarmament agenda forward if the Conference remains deadlocked in 2012. Now is the time to act rather than to debate endlessly.

The Republic of Korea is open to any constructive proposals to revitalize the Conference. As the next logical step towards a world free of nuclear weapons, we support the efforts of the international community to immediately initiate negotiations on the treaty banning the production of fissile materials for weapons, an issue most ripe and urgent for negotiation, along with the entry into force of the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty.

While every Government has its national security concerns and obligations associated with the FMCT, I believe that the national security interests of each country can be defended over the course of sincere discussions.

In four weeks, the Republic of Korea will host the 2012 Seoul Nuclear Security Summit. We shall spare no effort to ensure that the Seoul Summit contributes to securing vulnerable nuclear materials and strengthening measures to prevent nuclear terrorism, which is one of the most challenging threats to international security. In so doing, the Summit will help move us forward towards our shared goal of a world free of nuclear weapons. We further hope that the Seoul Summit will help nurture transparency and confidence among countries, which is a vital element in generating further momentum in the disarmament and non-proliferation field.

Preparations for the upcoming Summit are in their final stages, and the Republic of Korea looks to the leaders of the world to render their cooperation to ensure the success of the Seoul Nuclear Security Summit.

Taking this opportunity, I would like to address another barrier that needs to be overcome for the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons. Indeed, the North Korean nuclear issue has long presented a serious challenge to the nuclear disarmament and the international non-proliferation regime. Over the years, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has announced its withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, conducted two nuclear tests and even revealed its uranium enrichment programme, of which the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had long denied the existence.

The Republic of Korea, in close cooperation with its allies and neighbours, remains committed to realizing the denuclearization of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in a peaceful manner. In this regard, we recognize the importance of the recent bilateral discussions with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, from the inter-Korean dialogue last July to the United States-Democratic People's Republic of Korea dialogue which took place last week in Beijing. The momentum for dialogue should be maintained,

and we hope the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will demonstrate its willingness and sincerity toward denuclearization through concrete actions, thereby creating an appropriate environment for the resumption of the Six-Party Talks. I would like to reiterate that our efforts are aimed at making substantive progress in denuclearization, not at just having talks for the sake of talks.

I look forward to the international community rendering continued support for the path we are currently pursuing and once again urging the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to respond to our repeated calls for the abandonment of all nuclear weapons programmes in accordance with United Nations Security Council resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009).

I wish to conclude by reiterating the sincere hope that the Conference on Disarmament will emerge from its prolonged impasse and once again play the central role which it can and must play in the field of disarmament. It is a task which falls upon all of us, which requires our collective wisdom and a shared sense of responsibility.

Finally, Mr. President, we look forward to being guided onto a fruitful path under your excellent leadership.

**The President**: I would like to thank Mr. Kim Bong-hyun, Deputy Minister for Multilateral and Global Affairs, for his statement and for his kind words to the President. Now allow me to suspend the meeting for a short moment in order to escort the Deputy Minister from the chamber.

*The meeting was briefly suspended.*

**The President**: I would like to extend a warm welcome to Mr. R.M. Marty Natalegawa, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, and I have the pleasure and honour to invite the Minister to take the floor.

**Mr. Natalegawa** (Indonesia): Mr. President, it is indeed a great pleasure for me to speak before the Conference on Disarmament at its 2012 session today.

As the Conference is the world's sole multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament, Indonesia recognizes its importance to our common vision of a world free of nuclear weapons.

I therefore wish to begin by reiterating in the strongest manner possible Indonesia's support for the work of the Conference and, of course, for the overall cause of disarmament and non-proliferation. We recognize that this is not an easy task, as exemplified by the many challenges facing this Conference in the discharge of its important mandate, challenges that, at the moment, may seem to impede the Conference from making further progress.

Yet Indonesia comes to this meeting with a clear message and a clear conviction that progress is possible, that inaction is not an option, and that we need to be all of us a part of the solution, to transform challenges into opportunities.

Indonesia's own experience, and recent experience, I believe, testifies to this fact, that with strong political will, we can find ways and means to move the process forward.

This is exemplified, among others, by Indonesia's ratification of the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty or CTBT on 6 December 2011. By ratifying the Treaty, Indonesia once again affirmed its long-standing commitment to global nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and the peaceful use of nuclear energy, a commitment that is total and absolute.

Indonesia has thus increased the number of States that have ratified the Treaty to 156. Eight more ratifications from Annex II countries, and the Treaty will come into force.

Indonesia therefore invites all the remaining Annex II countries to lead by example by starting their ratification processes.

Aside from ratifying the Treaty, Indonesia has also striven to contribute more, not only at the national level but also at the regional level – and involving a nuclear-weapon State. Late last year, under Indonesia's chairmanship, member States of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) concluded negotiations with the nuclear-weapon States on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. This breakthrough came after more than 10 years of negotiations and, as a result, we have cleared the way for nuclear-weapon States' accession to the Protocol of the said zone.

We commend other ASEAN member States and the nuclear-weapon States for their constructive engagement with one another throughout the process. This is clear proof that progress is possible through intensive dialogue, constructive engagement and a mutual commitment.

In the same spirit, Indonesia continues to encourage discussions among countries in the Middle East and others to establish a similar regional arrangement for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East region. We believe that such an arrangement will be a significant contribution not only to the cause of global disarmament but also to confidence-building and efforts to achieve sustainable peace in the Middle East.

In spite of the many challenges facing the Conference, Indonesia remains optimistic. After all, the Conference already has some historic achievements to its credit. It was here that the biological and chemical weapons conventions, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the CTBT were first considered and negotiated.

We need to revive this spirit of achievement and, in this regard, I wish to recall two important points that the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Ban Ki-moon, cited at the opening of this session of the Conference, namely that this year the Conference will be under the spotlight as never before, and that we member States of the Conference should not sit idly by while the Conference declines into irrelevance.

Let me now offer some thoughts on how we can, perhaps, move the process forward. First, political will is imperative, and if we want to strengthen political will, the key is to build mutual confidence and to address the apparent trust deficit. Every country has the responsibility to create conditions conducive to the emergence of true dialogue amongst us.

Second, the global pursuit of disarmament and non-proliferation should be inclusive. It should be part of the global discourse. It must be nurtured at the grass-roots level. It must be given due attention by the general public, civil society and the media, so we can work with all elements of society to achieve our vision of a world without nuclear weapons.

Third, all nuclear-weapon States must demonstrate, in concrete ways, their commitment to disarmament. We encourage them to make this important political investment. On the part of non-nuclear States, we all have the responsibility to exert our utmost to bridge our differences, to lead by example.

Fourth, steps must be taken to revitalize the Conference and to strengthen its mechanism. It is imperative that the Conference resume its original function as the world's sole multilateral body for negotiating disarmament treaties. At the same time, we need to place it within the context of a changing world. Hence, we need to devise innovative approaches to make possible the resumption of meaningful negotiations.

In this regard Indonesia believes that some of the following steps are necessary. The Conference must adopt a balanced and comprehensive programme of work. The convening of a fourth special session on disarmament at the earliest feasible time warrants positive consideration. We also see the merit in establishing an ad hoc committee on nuclear

disarmament. We need to start negotiations on a phased programme, including a nuclear weapons convention, for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified time frame. And, we need to make the process more inclusive, through possible expansion of the membership of the Conference and possible participation of civil society and NGOs in that process.

Indonesia believes that implementation of the four points that I have just now mentioned may and will enable the Conference to advance negotiations on a number of vital undertakings. These include a nuclear weapons convention, negative security assurances, a treaty banning the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons, and the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Let me now briefly highlight a few more issues of particular importance.

We wish to reiterate the need to respect the right of States parties to the NPT to pursue peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and the importance of ensuring nuclear safety and security.

Apart from these, Indonesia is also committed to addressing other issues of disarmament in a non-discriminatory manner. These include the Biological Weapons Convention, the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Small Arms and Light Weapons Programme of Action and the arms trade treaty, and the need to respect all inherent rights of States equitably, including their territorial integrity, in future negotiations towards the arms trade treaty.

As long as even a single nuclear weapon exists, humankind remains in danger of a possible nuclear catastrophe – by design or by accident. Hence we must act now. The future of this Conference is in the hands of its member States, and we cannot allow the world at large to fall hostage to our inability to make progress.

Let me affirm once again our firm belief that progress is possible. Through shared commitment, through intensive dialogue, through constructive engagement, we can all be part of the solution. Let us therefore work together to ensure that the Conference moves forward in its programme of work, so that the Conference can fulfil its mandate, namely to translate into reality our shared vision of a world free of nuclear weapons, a safer world for all humankind.

**The President**: I would like to thank Mr. Natalegawa, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, for his statement. Now allow me to suspend the meeting for a short moment in order to escort the Minister from the chamber.

*The meeting was briefly suspended.*

**The President**: Excellencies, as you know, we were supposed to have with us today Mr. Ruslan Kazakbaev, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kyrgyzstan, but unfortunately the Minister could not attend it because of an urgent commitment, so I have the great pleasure and honour to invite Ambassador Iskakova to deliver the message of the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

**Ms. Iskakova** (Kyrgyzstan) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to convey apologies from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic, who is unable to attend this meeting. I shall read his statement in his place.

Permit me first to thank the Secretary-General of the Conference, Kassym-Jomart Tokayev, and the previous President, Ambassador Gallegos of Ecuador, for their invitation to take part in the work of the Conference on Disarmament in its 2012 session.

The nexus of international security, arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament has always been considered a priority foreign policy matter by Kyrgyzstan. For that reason,

we look upon the Conference as a unique and authoritative multilateral body, as much on account of its composition as for the magnitude of the tasks before it.

Although not a member of the Conference on Disarmament, Kyrgyzstan has demonstrated its commitment to the principles of comprehensive disarmament in practice and on more than one occasion, and intends to remain an active participant in that process. We comply fully and conscientiously with our obligations under international disarmament treaties.

One of the principal avenues leading in that direction is the strengthening of the international system of non-proliferation and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, upon which that system rests. We also consider the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty to be one of the keys to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, and to the maintenance of strategic stability and security.

The entry into force in Kyrgyzstan in February 2004 of its safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in connection with the NPT was a logical step towards preventing the spread of nuclear arms and materials that might be used in the construction of weapons of mass destruction, and ensuring the safe use of nuclear materials. In 2006, we signed the Additional Protocol for the application of safeguards.

The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in 2006 constituted an invaluable contribution to the process of global nuclear disarmament. Kyrgyzstan, as one of the initiators of and active participants in the creation of the zone, which was developed with the support of and under the auspices of the United Nations, is also a depositary of the Treaty.

In that context, we call on the nuclear Powers to support the initiative undertaken by Central Asian countries and to sign a protocol on negative security assurances. At the same time, we express our readiness to conduct a dialogue with the nuclear Powers with a view to the signature of a protocol on negative security assurances by the States parties to the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone.

Kyrgyzstan is also in favour of moving forward on multilateral dialogue regarding a fissile material cut-off, the prevention of an arms race in outer space and nuclear disarmament.

We attach no less importance to the United Nations Security Council resolution 1540 (2004), aimed at curbing the spread of weapons of mass destruction and related technologies and materials. We agree on the need to prevent non-State actors from obtaining access to nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, related technology and materials and their means of delivery, including through the implementation of resolution 1540. In order to implement its provisions, the Government of Kyrgyzstan is working to tighten its system of export controls.

The Export Control Act, which was passed in 2003, laid the basis for a national system of export controls. Given our commitment to strengthening the non-proliferation regime, the Government is currently introducing legislative amendments, based on the most recent experience of other States and international export control systems, aimed at improving its own system.

Moreover, with the aid of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe and the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, we are working to launch a national action plan in the very near future on the implementation of resolution 1540.

Kyrgyzstan is also taking appropriate measures at the national level to curb the illicit trade in small arms. We encourage the United Nations to participate actively in tackling this issue and support the proposal to draft legally binding international instruments to enable

the identification and tracing of small arms and light weapons, and to combat illicit brokering in small arms.

Another priority for us is the prohibition of the production and use of anti-personnel mines. We wholly support the United Nations Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and the Ottawa Convention. While backing the total prohibition of anti-personnel mines, Kyrgyzstan is in favour of a phased approach and gradual progress towards that goal.

Kyrgyzstan attaches great importance to the issue of lessening the damage caused to the environment by uranium mining and the associated nuclear fuel cycle. The issue was discussed at the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in 2000, 2005 and 2010. Of 36 tailings storage sites in Kyrgyzstan, 31 contain radioactive waste, including 28 with uranium tailings. Their total volume is 8.2 million cubic metres.

In that context, permit me to remind you that article 6 of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia states that each Party undertakes to assist any efforts toward the environmental rehabilitation of territories contaminated as a result of past activities related to the development, production or storage of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, in particular uranium tailings storage sites and nuclear test sites.

There has been a sharp increase in recent years in Kyrgyzstan in dangerous natural phenomena such as earthquakes, landslides and mudslides, the effects of which could wreck tailings storage sites and unleash ecological disasters that would transcend national borders. We are of the view that the damage that could emanate from uranium landfill sites could prove no less environmentally disastrous than the accidents at Chernobyl and Fukushima. We would therefore like to appeal again to delegations and international organizations with expertise in radioactive waste management to consider providing technical assistance.

At the sixty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly, President Rosa Otunbaeva of Kyrgyzstan emphasized the great importance of recovering land occupied by uranium tailings storage sites. The determination of Central Asian governments to resolve this sensitive issue together was demonstrated at a high-level international conference held in Geneva in September 2009. In that context, we intend to present a draft resolution in the near future to the General Assembly on forestalling the threat of radioactivity in Central Asia.

In conclusion, I would like to note that, in spite of the great number of serious issues placed on the Conference agenda each year, the past decade has unfortunately failed to produce any tangible results, and the unique potential of this forum remains on ice. We hope that the work of the Conference in 2012 will revive this multilateral platform for negotiation and restore its rightful status as a forum for reaching key international agreements.

**The President**: I thank the Ambassador of Kyrgyzstan, who delivered the speech on behalf of the Minister. Now allow me to suspend the meeting for a short moment in order to escort the Ambassador from the chamber.

*The meeting was briefly suspended.*

**Mr. So** Se Pyong (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Mr. President, since this is the first time the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has taken the floor under your presidency, let me extend our warm congratulations to you on the high assumption of your duties as the President of the Conference on Disarmament, and wish you success in your endeavours. You can rest assured of the full support and cooperation of the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Let me also take this opportunity to highly appreciate the Ambassador of Ecuador for the valuable contribution he made as the first President of the 2012 session of the Conference.

At the same time, I wish to thank the Secretary-General and his team members for their efforts in taking forward the work of the Conference.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is fully committed to the Conference on Disarmament, the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. It is for this reason that, like all other member States, my delegation expects the Conference will start its substantive work on all core issues including the nuclear disarmament in line with its mandate.

What is now particularly concerning is that some States wish to leave aside the Conference on Disarmament and turn to alternative negotiation processes while shifting the responsibility for the Conference's current inactivity on to another. These moves will not lead to useful and productive results in taking forward the agreed multilateral agenda with the participation of all relevant countries. Acknowledging the importance and continued validity of the consensus final document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea supports the proposal for the early convening of a fourth special session with a view to consolidating the multilateral disarmament agenda and machinery within the United Nations. In today's international relations, hegemonic policy and the use of force and nuclear blackmail are openly practised and translated into action. Arms conflicts and insecurity continue to persist in different parts of the world, threatening the right to existence of sovereign States. The Korean peninsula is not excluded from this. The nuclear issue together with the periodically explosive situation and the continuation of tension on the Korean peninsula originate from the hostile relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States, which gives rise to mistrust and confrontation. In the Nuclear Posture Review of April 2010, the United States officially announced that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was excluded from the list of the countries to receive a negative security assurance. This bespeaks in essence that the stand of the United States remains unchanged in its policy of pre-emptive nuclear strike against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Despite unanimous aspirations and demands at home and abroad for peace, arms build-up and nuclear war exercises are ceaselessly conducted on the Korean peninsula and in its vicinity against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Even at this moment, South Korea, in league with the United States, has embarked upon joint military exercises under the code name of Key Resolve/Foal Eagle with mobilization of the latest nuclear war equipment in South Korea, defying the repeated warnings of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. This proves that the United States and South Korea are to be blamed for harassed peace, escalated tension on the Korean peninsula and stalled North-South relations.

Nevertheless, South Korea is busy preparing to hold a nuclear security summit in late March. It is astonishing that a meeting with the issue of nuclear security is to be convened in South Korea, a nuclear advance base for the United States and the world's largest nuclear power magazine. Calling for nuclear security under such a situation of anti-Democratic People's Republic of Korea nuclear war games is a mockery and insult to the public at home and abroad. It will only lay one more stumbling block to the settlement of the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula and bring only disgrace and blemish to history.

Dialogue and confrontation cannot be compatible. Dialogue cannot be made under gunfire and naturally ends up in disputes. If South Korea is truly interested in a dialogue and a substantial improvement of North-South relations rather than lip service, it should immediately stop the war clamours targeting their fellow countrymen.

The international community still cherishes the happy memory of the meaningful days, the days which were inaugurated with the historic inter-Korean summit, the first of its kind since the national division, a series of events that followed the Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States Joint Communiqué, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea-Japan Pyongyang Declaration and discussion of talks for the declaration of the end of the Korean war, which instilled hope into the heart of mankind longing for national reunification and regional peace. All these signal events were precious results of the 15 June era of independent reunification that leader Kim Jong-il ushered in, pursuing Songun politics and fully guaranteeing the security of the Korean peninsula.

The 15 June North-South Joint Declaration and its action programme, the 4 October Declaration, were all provided by two Pyongyang summits held between North and South Korea. Those two declarations are a symbol of the 15 June reunification era and a beacon of reunification and peace. South Korea should make its intention clear first upon the implementation of the inter-Korean declarations before talking about the dialogue.

Implementation of the declarations is in full accord with the interests of all countries that show concern over peace in the Korean peninsula and North-East Asia. If a country truly wants to see the provision of security in the Korean peninsula, it should squarely face the fact that the only way to go is to implement the declarations that would lead to improved relations between the North and the South and, further, to peace and security in North-East Asia, instead of lending its ear to the sophism of the South Korean authorities.

As the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has clarified its position on many occasions, its withdrawal from the NPT is a legitimate self-defensive measure undertaken to protect the supreme interests and security of the country from the increasing nuclear threat from the United States. On the Korean peninsula, the NPT was unable to foil nuclear weapon deployment by a State which possesses the largest nuclear arsenals or stop its nuclear threat.

No one can be entitled to criticize a legal right of sovereign States. The uranium enrichment programme of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is purely for peaceful purposes. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea takes this opportunity to reiterate its position that it categorically rejected the United Nations Security Council resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009) and would not be bound by these resolutions.

The nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula has entirely originated from the hostile policy and nuclear threats of the United States against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and therefore the key party which is responsible and capable to address its root cause is none other than the United States.

More than half a century has passed since the end of the Korean war and no peace mechanism is set up so far, but there still exists the outdated armistice regime, a cold war legacy. Therefore, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States are in a state of war in legal or technical terms. As long as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States, the direct parties to the Korean Armistice Agreement, stand in confrontation by levelling guns at each other, neither the Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States mutual mistrust can be removed nor the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula be achieved indefinitely. As is well known, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea proposed at the beginning of 2010 the conclusion of a peace agreement. This proposal is the most effective confidence-building measure to remove mistrust between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States. The conclusion of this peace agreement proposed by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will play a role as a powerful driving force to ensure denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.

It is the consistent position of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to resume the Six-Party Talks without preconditions and discuss the implementation of the Joint Statement adopted on 19 September 2005 on the principle of simultaneous action. Nonetheless, the delay in the resumption of the talks is due to the United States which creates artificial obstacles while raising unreasonable preconditions apart from fulfilment of its obligation. The prospect of the resumption of the talks entirely depends upon the attitude of the United States to the positive efforts of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to ensure peace and stability of the Korean peninsula and realize denuclearization through dialogue and negotiation.

The nuclear deterrent of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has served as a powerful deterrent for preserving peace and stability in the Korean peninsula and other parts of North-East Asia.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, considering it as its sacred duty to safeguard peace and security and promote common prosperity on the Korean peninsula and the rest of the world, will do its utmost for their realization.

**Ms. Kennedy** (United States of America): Mr. President, I think the record of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the reaction of the international community speaks for itself. I will just say today that I found the substance of the remarks incorrect. I reject the substance of them, and I will also say I find them deeply disappointing. It was just last week that senior envoys of my Government met with representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, hosted by the Government of the People's Republic of China. This evidence of engagement I find on our part, therefore, in stark contrast to also the tenor of the remarks we just heard. I will only conclude by echoing the comments of Deputy Foreign Minister Kim Bong-hyun, in his hope that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will demonstrate its willingness and sincerity towards denuclearization through concrete actions, thereby creating an appropriate environment for the resumption of the Six-Party Talks.

If I may, I would also like to take this opportunity to comment on other statements we heard today, including the Foreign Minister of Iran.

Now, despite the stated commitment we heard to nuclear disarmament, we find Iran's failure to comply with its international obligations regarding its nuclear programme in sharp contrast. Indeed, I would submit that Iran has moved in the opposite direction by expanding its capacity to enrich uranium to nearly 20 per cent and continues to move forward with proscribed enrichment and heavy-water-related activities, all in violation of multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions. Iran continues to deny the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and broader international community the transparency and cooperation necessary to verify the exclusively peaceful nature of its nuclear programme.

The November IAEA Director General's report provided the most detailed account to date of the possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear programme. We believe that this report demonstrates that Iran has been deceiving the international community with respect to its nuclear intent and the nature of its programme. The activities in the report, taken together, can only plausibly be described as building blocks for a nuclear weapons programme. This is hardly illustrative of a commitment to nuclear disarmament. Instead, one could say that Iran's persistent stonewalling of the IAEA's investigation of a possible military dimension to its nuclear programme is very troubling. It is incumbent on Iran to provide credible assurance of the exclusively peaceful nature of its nuclear activities. And as we have repeatedly said, we do not dispute Iran's right to a peaceful nuclear programme, but with that right comes responsibility. Iran has a responsibility to address the urgent concerns of the international community.

**Mr. Lee** Joo-il (Republic of Korea): I just want to clarify some allegations of the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea mentioned exercise Key Resolve/Foal Eagle, but exercise Key Resolve is an annual training event designed to ensure readiness to defend the people of Korea and sustain the capabilities that strengthen the Republic of Korean-United States alliance. So, the United Nations Command Military Armistice Commission already informed the Democratic People's Republic of Korea military of the exercise dates and non-provocative and defence nature of this training in July.

I will reserve my further right of reply at a later stage.

**Mr. Jon** Yong Ryong (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to be very brief since my Ambassador has already made his statement in detail.

The joint military exercises have been scheduled at a time when the Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States talks were under way. Herein lie the brigandish arrogance and sinister attempt of the United States. The United States strategic attempts not only to stifle the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, but to put its neighbouring countries under military siege and contain them in a bid to realize its wild ambition for world domination, will face serious challenge. The luckless war drills targeting the Korean army and people, who are in a mourning period, amount to grave provocation. It would be a mistake to try to rattle or test the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by force.

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to urge South Korea to stop all acts of escalating confrontation and tension on the Korean peninsula not depending on outside forces. South Korea is also well advised to bear in mind the stand clarified by the Korean army and people that they will never deal with the current authorities of South Korea.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*

3 0112 115672260